Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

IRRIGATION.

Recd.	1915.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O. No. 150 I., 18th March 1915.

N. P.

Pammileru and Sitapalli vagu irrigation projects in the Godavari district

Recording papers connected with question No. 60 asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held in November 1914 regarding — and those connected with a deputation from the Gōdāvari District Association regarding the same.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

IRRIGATION.

Recd.	} 1915.	*Enclosures*	
Regd.		*Spare copies*	

G.O. No. 150 I., 18th March 1915.

N. P.

Pammileru and Sitapalli vagu irrigation projects in the Godavari district

Recording papers connected with question No. 60 asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held in November 1914 regarding — and those connected with a deputation from the Gōdāvari District Association regarding the same.

G.O. 151 I., 18th March 1915.

The note in the linked file gives details of the information available.

W.M.E.—2-11-14.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

The phraseology of the answer is rather matter for Public Works Department than for Revenue to settle, but Revenue may suggest the following variant for consideration:—

"The Government have perused the reports submitted by the officers who "investigated the projects referred to in the nineties, but they have not instituted "any further enquiries because they were satisfied by the perusal of the papers that "there was no prospect of working out any financially practicable scheme."

L. DAVIDSON—3-11-14.

To the Public Works Department (Irrigation) u.o.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

Submitted.

P.K.S.—4-11-14.

The Revenue Secretary's draft reply suggests that these reports were before Government some considerable time ago which is not the fact; but except for this, the general form of the reply proposed is considered better than that sent to Revenue.

The draft reply is amended as below:—

"The Government have perused the reports submitted by the officers who "investigated the projects referred to and they are satisfied that there is no prospect "of any financially practicable scheme being worked out. They do not propose to "institute further inquiries."

W.M.E.—4-11-14.

H. A. S[TUART]—4-11-14.

Two copies of the question and draft answer for transmission to Legislative are kept below for initials.

M.S.—5-11-14.
P.K.S.—5-11-14.

F.E.M.—5-11-14.

Pammileru and Sitapalli vagu irrigation projects, Gōdāvari district.

Question 60.—With reference to letter No. 119, dated 17th June 1914, from the Gōdāvari District Association to the Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch, furnishing available information regarding the investigation of the Pammileru and Sitapalli vagu projects, referred to in my question No. 110 asked at the meeting of the Council held on 19th May 1914, will Government be pleased to state whether inquiries have been instituted regarding the same?

Answer.—The Government have perused the reports submitted by the officers who investigated the projects referred to and they are satisfied that there is no prospect of any financially practicable scheme being worked out. They do not propose to institute further inquiries.

EXTRACT FROM THE NOTES OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S TOUR, 1914.

DEPUTATION FROM THE GODAVARI DISTRICT ASSOCIATION.

SUBJECT IV.—*That the construction of an outfall sluice or the raising of an embankment to the Torrigedda hill stream be ordered, and that the Sitapalli project be ordered to be investigated.*

* * * * *

Argument of the deputation.

Sitapalli.—It would appear that about 60,000 acres of land in the upland taluks can be irrigated, if this project investigated when Mr. Happell was Collector and Mr. Hamnett was the Sub-Collector, Rajahmundry, be sanctioned and taken on hand.

* * * * *

Collector's note.

Sitapalli project —The project relates to the question of diverting the waters of the Sitapalli vagu in order to extend the irrigation of upland villages in Rajahmundry taluk. The investigation of the project was taken in hand by the Public Works Department in 1894, but it was given up as the Superintending Engineer reported that it was not feasible from a financial point of view.

The question was moved by one of the Honourable Members in the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 19th May 1914, and it was asked why the project was not executed. The Government were pleased to say that no correspondence on the subject could be traced, but that inquiries would be made if the Honourable Member would furnish more detailed information. With reference to this, the Joint Secretary of the Gōdāvari District Association addressed Government in June last and stated that the Executive Engineer, Gōdāvari Eastern division, had submitted a report in 1894 to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, recommending the project. This is presumably the report sent to the Collector by the Superintending Engineer with his own remarks in 1894, referred to above; but it appears that neither the Superintending Engineer nor the Executive Engineer was in favour of the project as stated by the Joint Secretary to the District Association.

* * * * *

Secretariat note.

11. (*ii*) *Sitapalli project.*—In reply to a question on this subject asked by the Hon'ble Mr. Krishna Rao Pantulu at the meeting of the Council held on the 16th May 1914, it was stated that the Government could trace no correspondence on the scheme, but would make enquiries if the Additional Member would furnish more definite information. With reference to the above reply the Joint Secretary of the Gōdāvari District Association furnished in June last information as to the approximate dates of the investigation and the names of the officers who investigated the scheme. This was forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, who has submitted two reports, one prepared by Mr. Mitford Smith in 1893 and the other by Mr. Ussher in 1894. Mr. Mitford Smith states that there appears to have been some previous investigations, but of these there is no record of conclusions arrived at.

G.O. No. 255 I., dated 6th May 1914.

12. Mr. Mitford Smith scrutinised the levels previously taken in the reports from subordinates and summarises the conclusions he arrives at in his note. The proposal of the ryots, he says, was to construct a dam across the stream at Sitapalli and take thence a channel to the tanks in the Torrigedda basin.

The report goes on to say that this site appeared from the investigations made to be unsuitable and that it was found necessary to go a good deal higher up the stream to get a suitable site.

It is not said why this was considered necessary, presumably no record of this existed.

Apparently further investigations were made on a site higher up near Illapalli village and a line of levels run to connect this site with the Sudda calva, the stream in the Torrigedda basin which feeds the tanks which it is sought to benefit. From the result it appears that a channel connecting such a reservoir with the Sudda calva would entail much rock-cutting and tunnelling and would cost a very large sum. At this stage investigation stopped, apparently for want of establishment.

13. Having summarised the deductions made from the information available, Mr. Mitford Smith expresses the opinion he formed on an inspection of the country, which was that the proper site was near the originally proposed site and that here a "very large reservoir" might be formed. He proceeds to say there is no doubt such a work might be made, but that on account of the very feverish character of the country, enormously high rates would have to be paid, and adds that the best way of getting out the water to the tract to be irrigated would probably be a tunnel through the water-shed into the Sudda calva.

14. Mr. Mitford Smith adds that if a large reservoir were constructed it would probably not be necessary to tap the supply of the *Pammileru* to supplement the supply of the Sitapalli.

The Pammileru is a stream in the adjacent catchment to the north-west of Sitapalli vagu and apparently it had been proposed to divert the supply from the former to supplement that of the latter. It is not indicated how this was to be done.

It will be seen that Mr. Mitford Smith's report is very vague and that he did not concur in the idea that a site much higher up than Sitapalli was the proper one for a dam. No indication is given of what is meant by a "very large reservoir", of the capacity obtainable, or of the length of channel or tunnel required.

15. In the following year Mr. Ussher again took up the matter and had the levels run to ascertain the best alignment by which to lead water into the Sudda calva. His report, dated 7th February 1894, says that from inspection he formed the opinion that the project would be so very costly and that investigation was useless, but adds that, as there had been much correspondence regarding the matter extending back a long period, he decided to proceed with preliminary investigation so as to enable some decision on the matter to be come to.

Mr. Ussher's investigations confirm Mr. Mitford Smith's expectation that a tunnel would be the cheapest way to get the water into the tract to be irrigated. This tunnel, he says, would be nearly two miles long.

Mr. Ussher, while stating that it would no doubt be a great advantage to have a large reservoir on the Sitapalli river and a channel and tunnel taking the water from it into irrigable lands, says that such works would be, even if a suitable site for a dam could be found (which is apparently doubtful), of a prohibitive cost.

16. It will be seen that even Mr. Ussher's report leaves us with very few facts. The only ones indeed are—

(*a*) That a two-mile tunnel is necessary.
(*b*) That the catchment area is 135 square miles.

From the latter, taking a high duty of 60 acres per square mile, we get a maximum irrigable area of 8,100 acres, say 8,000 acres. Net revenue at Rs. 4–8–0 after paying cost of maintenance would come to Rs. 36,000. Capitalized at 20 times revenue this comes to Rs. 7,20,000. The tunnel two miles long with approaches cannot well cost less than 4 lakhs. This reservoir must have a capacity of not less than 1,000 millions cubic feet. The money available for the making of this reservoir, the irrigation canal from it and the distributary system is Rs. 3,20,000. The tract is very unhealthy. There is clearly no specially favourable site for the reservoir dam, and even under favourable circumstances as regards site, such a dam could not be constructed for anything like the sum available.

17. There is every reason to believe that no feasible project can be formulated for utilising the Sitapalli stream and I do not recommend any further investigation be undertaken. It is admitted, however, that the information available is by no means complete.

18. The matter is also the subject of a question proposed to be asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council to be held on the 20th instant. It is proposed to inform the Additional Member that there is no prospect of any financially practicable scheme being worked and that Government do not propose to institute further enquiries into the matter and this disposal has been approved in Council.

W.M.E.—18-11-14.

H. A. S[TUART]—18-11-14.

At 11 A.M. on Friday the 27th November 1914, His Excellency received a deputation from the Gōdāvari District Association. The deputation consisted of the following :—

M.R.Ry. Sri Rajah K. Ramachandra Raju Bahadur Garu,
,, Ch. Seshagiri Rao Pantulu Garu,
,, P. S. V. Gopalam Garu,
,, V. Suryanarayana Garu,
,, Sri G. Venkatapati Raju Garu,
,, N. Jayanna Garu,
,, D. Subba Rao Garu,
,, G. V. Rayappa Raju Garu, and
,, D. V. Suryaprakasarao Garu.

Besides Mr. M. R. Kharegat, Superintending Engineer, Mr. E. W. Lace, Executive Engineer, Gōdāvari Eastern division, M.R.Ry. S. Bhaskara Ayyar Avargal, Executive Engineer, Conservancy division, and Mr. C. B. Connell, Sub-Divisional officer, Public Works Department, Mr. E. B. Elwin, I.C.S., the Collector and Mr. C. B. Cotterell, I.C.S., the Private Secretary, were also present

* * * * *

(b) Another request from the same part of the district was with reference to a proposal known as the Sitapalli project. This was a proposal to divert certain agency streams towards the Rajahmundry taluk by means of dams, and by forming a reservoir which it was said would irrigate 70,000 acres. The deputation requested the appointment of a special officer to investigate the proposal adding that the local overseers were not willing to make a careful examination of it owing to the locality being malarious.

His Excellency promised to have these two points considered by the Government.

Generally His Excellency said that he required more consideration of the points raised and more information about them before he could give definite answers. The subjects had been clearly dealt with and thoroughly explained and the deputation had enabled him to understand clearly their criticisms and requests. The Gōdāvari system was a large one and no large system could be perfect and it was quite possible to find points to criticize. Such criticism would, he thought, assist the local officers who were anxious to work the system as well as it could be worked. He recommended the District Association to keep in touch with the Collector and the Public Works Department officers so that their suggestions and requirements could be fully appreciated. Finally even though it were admitted that reforms were required the Presidency as a whole had to be considered and even urgent reforms at one place might have to be delayed on account of more urgent requirements in others.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch, for remarks.

As regards the last two subjects of the deputation, His Excellency is not satisfied from the printed notes prepared for the tour that the requests have been sufficiently examined in the past. Unless it can be more clearly shown that neither of these schemes should be undertaken, His Excellency thinks that further examination on the spot is required. A

* * * * *

C. B. COTTERELL—29-11-14.

Please see portion marked **A** in the Private Secretary's note above. For orders if the Superintending Engineer may be asked to submit a full report after a personal inspection of the site.

G.V.—3-12-14.

P.K.S.—3-12-14.

As regards the Sitapalli project it is submitted that so far as can be judged from the admittedly imperfect investigation reported on by Messrs. Mitford Smith and Ussher the prospects of a project being produced which would be likely to be feasible are very remote. If anything further is to be done a more detailed investigation than has hitherto been undertaken will be necessary. If the Tank Restoration Scheme grants of next year have to be reduced, establishment will be set free from works which might be diverted to this investigation.

Received with the Superintending Engineer's letter No. 701 I./G.L., dated 6th October 1914.

2. With all respect it is, however, submitted that the notes on the subject although not giving all desirable information give sufficient to show that there is no hope of a feasible project materializing.

W.M.E.—3-12-14.

I read all the papers regarding these projects when the previous notes were submitted to me and I saw no reason to differ from our expert adviser, the Chief Engineer. It would be useless for me to note further until I know His Excellency's reasons for thinking that a further examination on the spot is required.

H. A. S[TUART]—6-12-14.

W.M.E.—7-12-14.

His Excellency does not propose to press the matter further at present.

These notes are returned for record.

H. G. STOKES—3-3-15.

W.M.E.—8-3-15.

H. A. S[TUART]—9-3-15.

A draft order recording the papers is submitted for approval.

G.V.—16-3-15.

P.K.S.—17-3-15.

F.E.M.—17-3-15.

W.M.E.—17-3-15.

[Issued as G.O. No. 150 I., dated 18th March 1915.]

Sectt. II—10 (a)—7,000—4-13.

P.W. DEPARTMENT. (Irrigation)

Pamuleru and Sitapalli vagu irrigation projects in the Godavari Dt.
Recording papers connected with Qn. no. 60 asked at the meeting of the Leg. Council held in Novr. 1914 and those connected with a deputation from the Godavari Dt. Assocn. re the same.

Legislative Projects.

(9-LF.) READ AGAIN G.O. No. , dated March 1915.

" " " " , " 191 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. From the , No. , dated 191

Print

" " Notes connected with Question No 60 (original No 47) asked by the Hon'ble Mr. K.R.V. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Leg. Council held on the 20th Novr. 1914 re the Pamuleru and Sitapalli vagu irrigation projects in the Godavari Dt. and the answer given thereto. 191

" " Notes connected with a deputation from the Godavari Dt. Association, re the Sitapalli vagu and other irrigation projects in the Godavari Dt. 191

ORDER.

Press.

No. ~~1191~~ 150 I, dated 18 · 3 — 1915.

Print Notes.

Recorded.

[signature] 17/3/15

D.S.

[initials] 16.3.15

Not E.T